

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
 Seventeenth Floor  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
 (702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
 kic@kempjones.com

J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
**Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP**  
 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
 Seventeenth Floor  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
 Telephone: (702) 385-6000  
 Facsimile: (702) 385-6001

Patrick W. Powers, Esq.  
 Peyton J. Healey, Esq.  
**Meredith Mathews**  
 8150 North Central Expressway #1575  
 Dallas, Texas 75206

Willie C. Briscoe, Esq.  
**The Briscoe Law Firm**  
 8117 Preston Road #300  
 Dallas, Texas 75225  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*  
*Rene A. Freely and Brian Freely*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RENE A. FREELY AND BRIAN FREELY,  
 individually and on behalf of all those similarly  
 situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

JODY LINDELL, JOHN MCLAUGHLIN, PAUL  
 SANDMAN, HAROLD SELICK, PH.D., DAVID  
 W. GRYSKA ,

Defendants.

-and-

PDL BIOPHARMA, INC.

Nominal Defendant.

Case No.:  
 Dept. No.:

**SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE  
 COMPLAINT**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Plaintiffs, by and through their attorneys, bring this action derivatively on  
 behalf of nominal defendant PDL Biopharma, Inc. ("PDL" or the "Company"). This

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 Complaint is based on personal knowledge as to themselves, and as to all other matters  
2 based upon the investigation conducted by their attorneys, which included, among other  
3 things, a review of filings with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission  
4 (“SEC”), documents, analyst reports, news reports, press releases, and other publicly-  
5 available information regarding the Company. This action brought on behalf of the  
6 Company against the members of its Board of Directors (“Board”) and/or certain of its  
7 executive officers seeking to remedy Defendants’ breaches of fiduciary duties and other  
8 violations of the law that occurred from November 6, 2013 and September 16, 2014 (the  
9 “Class Period”).  
10

11 2. PDL BioPharma manages a portfolio of patents and royalty assets. The  
12 Company is involved in the humanization of monoclonal antibodies and the discovery of  
13 a new generation of targeted treatments for cancer and immunologic diseases. The  
14 Company was formerly known as Protein Design Labs, Inc. and changed its name to PDL  
15 BioPharma, Inc. in 2006. PDL BioPharma, Inc. was founded in 1986, is headquartered in  
16 Incline Village, Nevada, and trades on the NASDAQ Global Select Market  
17 (“NASDAQ”) under the ticker symbol “PDLI.”  
18

19 3. The Company owns patents in the United States and elsewhere, covering  
20 the humanization of antibodies, which the Company refers to as Queen et al. patents. The  
21 Queen et al. patents cover, among other things, humanized antibodies, methods for  
22 humanizing antibodies, polynucleotide encoding in humanized antibodies and methods of  
23 producing humanized antibodies. However, final patent expiry for the Queen et al.  
24 patents is set for December 2014, jeopardizing the Company's ability to pay dividends to  
25 its shareholders going forward.  
26  
27  
28



1           4.       Recently, however, the Company has announced the strategic decision to  
2 continue its operations post expiration of the Queen et al. patents and to continue the  
3 strategy of pursuing new income generating assets so as to extend its ability to pay  
4 dividends to its shareholders.

5           5.       As part of the Company's ongoing strategy, on October 21, 2013, the  
6 Company issued a press release announcing the acquisition of the rights to receive  
7 royalties and milestones payable on sales of Type 2 diabetes products licensed by  
8 Depomed in exchange for a \$240.5 million cash payment. Pursuant to the transaction,  
9 PDL BioPharma would receive all royalty and milestone payments due under the  
10 agreements until it has received payments equal to two times the cash payment made to  
11 Depomed, after which all payments received will be shared evenly between PDL  
12 BioPharma and Depomed. At the time of the transaction, the Company classified the  
13 acquired asset as an intangible asset.

14           6.       Throughout the Class Period, Defendants made false and/or misleading  
15 statements, and failed to disclose material adverse facts about the Company's business,  
16 operations, prospects and performance. Specifically, during the Class Period, Defendants  
17 made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose that: (1) the Company  
18 was overstating its: (i) total revenues; (ii) royalty revenues; (iii) net income; and (iv) net  
19 cash provided by operating activities; (2) the Company was understating its operating  
20 expenses; (3) the Company failed to properly classify royalty and milestone payments  
21 due under an agreement with Depomed; and (4) as a result of the above, the Company's  
22 financial statements were materially false and misleading at all relevant times.

23           7.       On May 12, 2014, the Company filed a Form 10-Q with the SEC  
24 reiterating the announced results for the first quarter ended March 31, 2014, and also  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 disclosing that PDL BioPharma was currently engaged in ongoing discussions with the  
2 SEC staff after receiving a comment letter to the Company's Annual Report on Form 10-  
3 K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2013, that requested additional information  
4 about the Company's accounting for the royalty purchase and sale agreement with  
5 Depomed. At the time, the Company classified the asset as an intangible asset, but was  
6 being asked to support its position and explain why it is not a financial asset.  
7

8 8. On August 8, 2014, the Company issued a press release announcing that it  
9 had filed a Form 12b-25 Notification of Late Filing with the SEC allowing for a five-day  
10 extension to file its Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the period ended June 30, 2014.  
11 According to the press release, the Company could not finalize its financial statements for  
12 the quarter ended June 30, 2014, due to additional time necessary to address SEC  
13 comments and finalize its review related to the change in the accounting treatment of the  
14 acquisition of Depomed royalty rights. As a result of the delay in filing the quarterly  
15 report, PDL BioPharma postponed its second quarter earnings release call, originally  
16 scheduled for Monday, August 11, 2014.  
17

18 9. Finally, on September 16, 2014, after the market closed, the Company  
19 filed a Form 8-K with the SEC announcing that on September 11, 2014, PDL BioPharma  
20 was orally notified by its independent registered accounting firm, Ernst & Young LLP  
21 ("EY") that it was resigning effective September 11, 2014. The resignation was  
22 confirmed in a letter delivered to the Company on September 15, 2014.  
23

24 10. On this news, PDL's stock plummeted \$1.17 per share to close at \$8.48  
25 per share on September 17, 2014, a one-day decline of over 12% on heavy trading  
26 volume.  
27  
28



## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

13. This Court has jurisdiction over each Defendant because each Defendant is either a corporation that conducts business in this District, or has sufficient minimum contacts with this forum so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction by the district courts permissible under traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

## PARTIES

Page 5 of 33

1 Company throughout the Class Period. They currently owns 1500 shares of stock and  
2 made their first purchase on November 8, 2012.

3 16. Nominal Defendant PDL Biopharma, Inc. is incorporated in Delaware and  
4 maintains its headquarters at 932 Southwood Blvd, Incline Village, Nevada 89451.  
5 Defendant may be served at that address.  
6

7 17. Defendant Jody Lindell ("Lindell") is, and at all relevant times was, a  
8 director of the Company. Lindell was elected to the Board of Directors in March 2009.  
9 She serves as chair of the Audit Committee, a member of the Compensation Committee  
10 and a member of the Nominating and Governance Committee. She can be served at 932  
11 Southwood Blvd, Incline Village, Nevada 89451 or wherever she may be found.

12 18. Defendant John McLaughlin ("McLaughlin") is, and at all relevant times  
13 was, a director of the Company. He was elected to the Board of Directors of the  
14 Company in October 2008. He is also the President and CEO of the company and has  
15 been since December 18, 2008. McLaughlin is a member of the Litigation Committee.  
16 He can be served at 932 Southwood Blvd, Incline Village, Nevada 89451, or wherever he  
17 may be found.  
18

19 19. Defendant Paul Sandman ("Sandman") is, and at all relevant times was, a  
20 director of the Company. He was elected to the Board in October 2008. He is a member  
21 of the Compensation Committee and the Nominating and Governance Committee, as well  
22 as being the chair of the Litigation Committee. He can be served at 932 Southwood  
23 Blvd, Incline Village, Nevada 89451 or wherever he may be found.  
24

25 20. Defendant Harold Selick, Ph.D. ("Selick") is, and at all relevant times  
26 was, a director of the Company. He was elected to the Board in August 2009. He is a  
27 member of the Audit Committee and the Litigation Committee, and chair of the  
28



1 Compensation Committee and Nominating and Governance Committees. Selick can be  
2 served at 932 Southwood Blvd, Incline Village, Nevada 89451 or wherever he may be  
3 found.

4 21. Defendant David W. Gryska ("Gryska") is a director of the Company. He  
5 was elected to the Board on March 10, 2014. He is a member of the Audit Committee  
6 and the Nominating and Governance Committee. He can be served at 932 Southwood  
7 Blvd, Incline Village, Nevada 89451 or wherever she may be found.

8 22. The Defendants referenced above in ¶¶ 17 through 21 are collectively  
9 referred to herein as the "Individual Defendants."

#### 11 DUTIES OF THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS

12 23. By reason of their positions as officers and/or directors of the Company,  
13 and because of their ability to control the business and corporate affairs of the Company,  
14 the Individual Defendants owed the Company and its shareholders the fiduciary  
15 obligations of good faith, trust, loyalty, and due care, and were, and are, required to use  
16 their utmost ability to control and manage the Company in a fair, just, honest, and  
17 equitable manner. The Individual Defendants were, and are, required to act in  
18 furtherance of the best interests of the Company and its shareholders so as to benefit all  
19 shareholders equally and not in furtherance of their personal interests or benefit.

20 24. Each director and officer owed to the Company and its shareholders the  
21 fiduciary duty to exercise good faith and diligence in the administration of the affairs of  
22 the Company and in the use and preservation of its property and assets, and the highest  
23 obligations of fair dealing. In addition, as officers and/or directors of a publicly held  
24 company, the Individual Defendants had a duty to promptly disseminate accurate and  
25 truthful information concerning the Company's revenue, margins, operations,  
26  
27  
28

1 performance, management, projections, and forecasts, so that the market price of the  
2 Company's stock would be based on truthful and accurate information.

3 25. The Individual Defendants, because of their positions of control and  
4 authority as directors, were able to, and did, directly and/or indirectly, exercise control  
5 over the wrongful acts complained of herein, as well as the contents of the various public  
6 statements issued by the Company. Because of their executive, managerial, and/or  
7 directorial positions within the Company, each of the Individual Defendants had access to  
8 adverse, non-public information about the Company's financial condition and operations,  
9 and the misrepresentations made relevant thereto.

10  
11 26. At all times relevant hereto, each of the Individual Defendants was the  
12 agent of the other Individual Defendants and of the Company, and was at all times acting  
13 within the course and scope of such agency.

14  
15 27. To discharge their duties, the Individual Defendants were required to  
16 exercise reasonable and prudent supervision over the management, policies, practices and  
17 controls of the financial affairs of the Company. By virtue of such duties, the Individual  
18 Defendants were required to, among other things:

19 a. manage, conduct, supervise and direct the business affairs of the  
20 Company in accordance with all applicable laws;

21 b. neither violate, nor knowingly permit any officer, director or  
22 employee of the Company to violate, applicable laws, rules and regulations;

23 c. establish and maintain systematic and accurate records and reports  
24 of the business and affairs of the Company and procedures for the reporting of the  
25 business and affairs to the Board and to periodically investigate, or cause independent  
26 investigation to be made of, said reports and records;  
27  
28



1 d. neither engage in self-dealing, nor knowingly permit any officer,  
2 director or employee of the Company to engage in self-dealing;

3 e. ensure that the Company complied with its legal obligations and  
4 requirements, including acting only within the scope of its legal authority and  
5 disseminating truthful and accurate statements to the SEC and the investing public;

6 f. conduct the affairs of the Company in an efficient, business-like  
7 manner so as to make it possible to provide the highest quality performance of its  
8 business, to avoid wasting the Company's assets, and to maximize the value of the  
9 Company's stock;

10 g. properly and accurately guide investors and analysts regarding the  
11 true financial condition of the Company at any given time, including making accurate  
12 statements about the Company's financial results and prospects, and ensuring that the  
13 Company maintained an adequate system of financial controls such that the Company's  
14 financial reporting would be true and accurate at all times; and

15 h. remain informed regarding how the Company conducted its  
16 operations, and, upon receipt of notice or information of imprudent or unsound conditions  
17 or practices, to make reasonable inquiry in connection therewith, and to take steps to  
18 correct such conditions or practices and make such disclosures as necessary to comply  
19 with applicable laws.

20  
21  
22  
23 28. Each Individual Defendant, by virtue of his position as a director, owed to  
24 the Company and its shareholders the fiduciary duties of loyalty, good faith, the exercise  
25 of due care and diligence in the management and administration of the affairs of the  
26 Company, as well as in the use and preservation of its property and assets. The conduct  
27 of the Individual Defendants alleged herein involves a violation of their obligations as  
28

1 directors of the Company, the absence of good faith on their part, and a reckless disregard  
2 for their duties to the Company and its shareholders that the Individual Defendants were  
3 aware, or should have been aware, posed a risk of serious injury to the Company.

4 29. The Individual Defendants breached their duties of loyalty and good faith  
5 by allowing Defendants to cause, or by themselves causing, the Company to misrepresent  
6 its financial results and prospects, as detailed herein, and by failing to prevent employees  
7 and/or officers of the Company from taking such illegal actions. In addition, the  
8 Company is now the subject of class action litigation alleging violation of federal  
9 securities laws, which necessitates the Company to incur excess costs arising from the  
10 Individual Defendants' wrongful course of conduct.

#### 11 **CONSPIRACY, AIDING AND ABETTING, AND CONCERTED ACTION**

12 30. In committing the wrongful acts alleged herein, the Individual Defendants  
13 have pursued, or joined in the pursuit of, a common course of conduct, and have acted in  
14 concert with, and conspired with, one another in furtherance of their common plan or  
15 design. In addition to the wrongful conduct herein alleged as giving rise to primary  
16 liability, the Individual Defendants further aided and abetted and/or assisted each other in  
17 breach of their respective duties.

18 31. During all times relevant hereto, the Individual Defendants collectively  
19 and individually initiated a course of conduct that was designed to and did:

- 20
- 21 (a) Conceal the fact that the Company was improperly misrepresenting  
22 its financial results in order to allow defendants to artificially inflate the  
23 price of the Company's shares;
- 24
- 25 (b) Maintain the Individual Defendants' executive and directorial  
26 positions at the Company and the profits, power, and prestige that the  
27 Individual Defendants enjoyed as a result of these positions; and
- 28 (c) Deceive the investing public, including shareholders of the  
Company, regarding the Individual Defendants' management of the



1 Company's operations, the Company's financial health and stability, and  
2 future business prospects, specifically related to the Company's financial  
3 condition that had been misrepresented by the Individual Defendants  
throughout the Relevant Period.

4 32. In furtherance of this plan, conspiracy, and course of conduct, the  
5 Individual Defendants collectively and individually took the actions set forth herein.

6 33. The Individual Defendants engaged in a conspiracy, common enterprise,  
7 and/or common course of conduct during the Relevant Period. During this time, the  
8 Individual Defendants caused the Company to conceal material facts, misrepresent its  
9 financial results, and violate applicable laws. In addition, the Individual Defendants also  
10 made other specific, false statements about the Company's financial performance and  
11 future business prospects, as alleged herein.

12 34. The purpose and effect of the Individual Defendants' conspiracy, common  
13 enterprise, and/or common course of conduct was, among other things: (1) to disguise the  
14 Individual Defendants' breaches of fiduciary duty, abuse of control, gross  
15 mismanagement, waste of corporate assets, and unjust enrichment; (2) to conceal adverse  
16 information concerning the Company's operations, financial condition, and future  
17 business prospects; and (3) to artificially inflate the price of the Company's stock so that  
18 the Individual Defendants could protect and enhance their executive and directorial  
19 positions and the substantial compensation and prestige they obtained as a result thereof.

20 35. The Individual Defendants accomplished their conspiracy, common  
21 enterprise, and/or common course of conduct by causing the Company to purposefully,  
22 recklessly or negligently misrepresent its financial results. Because the actions described  
23 herein occurred under the authority of the Board, each of the Individual Defendants was a  
24 direct, necessary and substantial participant in the conspiracy, common enterprise, and/or  
25 common course of conduct alleged herein.

1           36. Each of the Individual Defendants aided and abetted and rendered  
2 substantial assistance in the wrongs alleged herein. In taking such actions to substantially  
3 assist the commission of the wrongdoing alleged herein, each Individual Defendant acted  
4 with knowledge of the primary wrongdoing, substantially assisted the accomplishment of  
5 that wrongdoing, and was aware of his or her overall contribution to, and furtherance of,  
6 the wrongdoing.  
7

## 8                                   SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

### 9           Background

10           37. PDL is a biopharmaceutical company focused on intellectual property  
11 asset management, investing in income generating assets and maximizing the value of its  
12 patent portfolio and related assets. PDL pioneered the humanization of monoclonal  
13 antibodies, and by doing so, enabled the discovery of a new generation of targeted  
14 treatments for cancer and immunologic diseases. The Company receives royalties based  
15 on sales of humanized antibody products marketed today and may also receive royalty  
16 payments on additional humanized antibody products that are manufactured or launched  
17 before final patent expiry in December 2014 or which are otherwise subject to a royalty  
18 for licensed know-how under the Company's agreements. Under PDL's current licensing  
19 agreements, the Company is entitled to receive a flat-rate or tiered royalty based upon  
20 licensees' net sales of covered antibodies.  
21

22           38. The Company owns patents covering the humanization of antibodies,  
23 which the Company refers to as Queen et al. patents. The Queen et al. patents cover,  
24 among other things, humanized antibodies, methods for humanizing antibodies,  
25 polynucleotide encoding in humanized antibodies and methods of producing humanized  
26 antibodies. However, final patent expiry for the Queen et al. patents is set for December  
27  
28



1 2014, jeopardizing the Company's ability to pay dividends to its shareholders going  
2 forward.

3 39. Recently, however, the Company announced the strategic decision to  
4 continue its operations post expiration of the Queen et al. patents and to continue the  
5 strategy of pursuing new income generating assets so as to extend its ability to pay  
6 dividends to its shareholders.

7  
8 40. In an effort to move forward on that strategy, on October 21, 2013, the  
9 Company issued a press release announcing the acquisition of the rights to receive  
10 royalties and milestones payable on sales of Type 2 diabetes products licensed by  
11 Depomed in exchange for a \$240.5 million cash payment. As part of that transaction,  
12 PDL would receive all royalty and milestone payments due under the agreements until it  
13 has received payments equal to two times the cash payment made to Depomed, after  
14 which all payments received will be shared evenly between PDL and Depomed. At the  
15 time of the transaction, the Company classified the acquired asset as an intangible asset.

16  
17 **Materially False and Misleading Statements Issued During the Period**

18 41. On November 6, 2013, the first day of the Class Period, the Company  
19 issued a press release announcing the financial results for the third quarter and nine  
20 months ended September 30, 2013. The press release stated, in part:

21 Total revenues for the third quarter of 2013 increased 14 percent to \$97.3  
22 million from \$85.2 million reported in the third quarter of 2012. For the  
23 first nine months of 2013, total revenues increased 15 percent to \$332.8  
million from \$288.5 million reported in the comparable period of 2012.

24 Royalty revenues for the third quarter of 2013 are based on second quarter  
25 2013 product sales by PDL's licensees. The year- to-date royalty revenue  
26 growth is driven by increased sales of Avastin®, Herceptin®, Lucentis®,  
27 Perjeta®, Kadcyla®, and Actemra® by PDL's licensees in the fourth  
28 quarter of 2012 and first and second quarters of 2013. Net sales of  
Avastin, Herceptin, Lucentis, Xolair®, Perjeta, and Kadcyla are subject to  
a tiered royalty rate except in the case when the product is ex-U.S.



1 manufactured and sold, in which case it is subject to a flat three percent  
2 royalty rate.

3 General and administrative expenses for the third quarter of 2013 were  
4 \$7.9 million, compared with \$5.6 million in the same quarter of 2012. For  
5 the nine months ended September 30, 2013, general and administrative  
6 expenses were \$21.9 million compared to \$17.7 million in the comparable  
7 period of 2012. The increase in expenses for both the quarter and nine  
8 months ended September 30, 2013, was a result of increased legal  
9 expenses related to ongoing litigation.

10 Net income for the third quarter of 2013 was \$56.2 million, or \$0.36 per  
11 diluted share, as compared with net income of \$48.6 million, or \$0.32 per  
12 diluted share, in the same quarter of 2012. The increase in net income in  
13 the third quarter is primarily due to a 13 percent increase in royalty  
14 revenues. Net income for the first nine months of 2013 was \$203.4  
15 million, or \$1.31 per diluted share, as compared with net income of \$162.3  
16 million, or \$1.08 per diluted share, in the same period of 2012.

17 Net cash provided by operating activities in the first nine months of 2013  
18 was \$209.7 million, compared with \$158.6 million for the first nine  
19 months of 2012. At September 30, 2013, PDL had cash, cash equivalents  
20 and investments of \$326.5 million, compared with \$148.7 million at  
21 December 31, 2012. The increase was primarily attributable to net cash  
22 provided by operating activities of \$209.7 million and repayment of notes  
23 receivable of \$58.1 million, offset in part by payment of dividends of  
24 \$62.9 million and cash advanced on notes receivable of \$48.7 million.

25 “We are gratified by the continued success of our asset acquisition  
26 strategy, including the four additional transactions completed in the past  
27 month, and believe that—with ROI at top-of-mind—we are continuing to  
28 add long term value for the company and our stockholders,” stated John P.  
McLaughlin, president and chief executive officer of PDL. “Our goal is to  
be the financial partner of choice to leading life science companies and  
other institutions seeking to access non-dilutive capital, and we are  
actively looking to expand our portfolio. With the conclusion of the four  
recent transactions, PDL has deployed \$368 million in capital in 2013 and  
\$496 million in total to acquire new income generating assets to support  
our dividend payments.”

42. That same day, the Company filed a Form 10-Q with the SEC which was  
signed by Defendant McLaughlin, and reiterated the Company’s previously announced  
quarterly financial results and financial position. In addition, the Form 10-Q contained  
signed certifications pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”) by Defendant



1 McLaughlin, stating that the financial information contained in the Form 10-Q was  
2 accurate and disclosed any material changes to the Company's internal control over  
3 financial reporting.

4 43. On March 3, 2014, the Company issued a press release announcing results  
5 for the fourth quarter and full year ended December 31, 2013. The press release stated, in  
6 part:  
7

8 Total revenues in 2013 increased 18 percent to \$442.9 million from  
9 \$374.5 million in 2012. For the fourth quarter of 2013, total revenues were  
10 \$110.1 million, compared to \$86.0 million in the fourth quarter of 2012.  
11 Royalty revenues for the fourth quarter of 2013 are based on third quarter  
12 2013 product sales by PDL's licensees to the Queen et al. patents and on  
13 Depomed's Glumetza® royalties related to October and November 2013  
14 U.S. sales. PDL recognized \$11.2 million in revenue related to the  
15 Depomed royalties in the fourth quarter of 2013.

16 The full year 2013 royalty revenue growth over the full year 2012 is  
17 driven by increased sales of Avastin®, Herceptin®, Lucentis®, Xolair®,  
18 Perjeta®, Kadcyla®, Tysabri®, and Actemra® by PDL's licensees, along  
19 with the addition of the royalty payments from PDL's purchase of  
20 Depomed's diabetes-related royalties. Net sales of Avastin, Herceptin,  
21 Lucentis, Xolair, Perjeta, and Kadcyla were subject to a tiered royalty rate  
22 except in the case when the product is ex-U.S. manufactured and sold, in  
23 which case it was subject to a flat three percent royalty rate. Under the  
24 terms of a settlement agreement, entered into on January 31, 2014, and  
25 effective retroactively to August 15, 2013, Genentech will pay a fixed  
26 royalty rate of 2.125 percent on worldwide sales of all licensed products,  
27 as compared to the previous tiered royalty rate in the U.S and the fixed  
28 rate on all ex-U.S. based manufactured and sold licensed products. The  
retroactive change in royalty rate from August 15, 2013, to December 31,  
2013, will be recognized as royalty revenue by PDL in the first quarter of  
2014.

Operating expenses in 2013 were \$35.4 million, compared with \$25.5  
million in 2012. The increase in expenses for the year ended December 31,  
2013, was a result of the amortization for the Depomed intangible asset, an  
increase in professional services for other income generating assets, and  
increased legal expenses related to the settled litigation. For the fourth  
quarter of 2013, operating expenses were \$13.5 million compared with  
\$7.7 million for the same period in 2012. The increase in expenses for the  
quarter ended December 31, 2013, was a result of the Depomed intangible  
asset amortization.



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kic@kempjones.com

1 Net income in 2013 was \$264.5 million, or \$1.66 per diluted share, as  
2 compared with net income in 2012 of \$211.7 million, or \$1.45 per diluted  
3 share. Net income for the fourth quarter of 2013 was \$61.1 million, or  
4 \$0.39 per diluted share, as compared with net income of \$49.4 million for  
5 the same period of 2012, or \$0.34 per diluted share. The increase in net  
6 income in the fourth quarter is primarily due to a 27 percent increase in  
7 royalty revenues.

8 Net cash provided by operating activities in 2013 was \$270.9 million,  
9 compared with \$210.2 million in 2012. At December 31, 2013, PDL had  
10 cash, cash equivalents and investments of \$99.5 million, compared with  
11 \$148.7 million at December 31, 2012. The decrease was primarily  
12 attributable to the purchase of the Depomed intangible asset of \$241.3  
13 million, cash advanced on notes receivable of \$148.7 million, payment of  
14 dividends of \$84.0 million, offset in part by net cash provided by  
15 operating activities of \$270.9 million and repayment of notes receivable of  
16 \$58.1 million.

17 44. That same day, the Company filed a Form 10-K with the SEC which was  
18 signed by Defendant McLaughlin, and reiterated the Company's previously announced  
19 quarterly financial results and financial position. In addition, the Form 10-K contained  
20 signed SOX certifications by Defendant McLaughlin, stating that the financial  
21 information contained in the Form 10-K was accurate and disclosed any material changes  
22 to the Company's internal control over financial reporting.

23 45. On May 12, 2014, the Company issued a press release announcing results  
24 for the first quarter ended March 31, 2014. The press release stated, in part:

25 Total revenues for the first quarter of 2014 increased 52 percent to \$139.7  
26 million from \$91.8 million in the first quarter of 2013. Royalty revenues  
27 for the first quarter of 2014 are based on fourth quarter 2013 product sales  
28 by PDL's licensees to the Queen et al. patents, royalty payments from  
PDL's purchase of Depomed's diabetes- related royalties, and include a  
one-time \$5 million retroactive payment from Genentech related to our  
settlement agreement.

The first quarter 2014 royalty revenue growth over first quarter of 2013 is  
driven by increased sales of Avastin®, Herceptin®, Xolair®, Perjeta®,  
Kadcyla®, and Actemra® by PDL's licensees, the addition of \$23.6  
million in royalty revenue from PDL's purchase of Depomed's diabetes-  
related royalties, the \$5 million retroactive payment from Genentech, and  
an increase in royalties from the Genentech settlement as a result of a



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kjc@kempjones.com

1 fixed royalty rate of 2.125 percent on worldwide sales of all licensed  
2 products in 2014, as compared to the previous lower blended rate based  
3 upon a tiered royalty rate in the U.S. and the fixed rate on all ex-U.S based  
4 manufactured and sold licensed products.

5 Operating expenses in the first quarter of 2014 were \$16.5 million,  
6 compared with \$7.2 million in the first quarter of 2013. The increase of  
7 expenses in the quarter ended March 31, 2014, was a result of the non-  
8 cash amortization expense of \$11.9 million for the Depomed royalty and  
9 milestone purchase, offset in part by decreased legal expenses from the  
10 settlement of legal proceedings with Genentech.

11 Net income in the first quarter of 2014 was \$72.9 million, or \$0.44 per  
12 diluted share, as compared with net income in the first quarter of 2013 of  
13 \$53.5 million, or \$0.36 per diluted share. The increase in net income in the  
14 first quarter is primarily due to the increase in royalty revenues.

15 Net cash provided by operating activities in the first quarter of 2014 was  
16 \$91.8 million, compared with \$52.9 million in the first quarter of 2013. At  
17 March 31, 2014, PDL had cash, cash equivalents and investments of  
18 \$337.6 million, compared with \$99.5 million at December 31, 2013. The  
19 increase was primarily attributable to proceeds from the issuance of  
20 convertible notes of \$300.0 million, proceeds from the issuance of  
21 warrants of \$11.4 million, and net cash provided by operating activities of  
22 \$91.8 million, offset in part by cash advanced on notes receivable of \$50.0  
23 million, purchase of call options of \$31.0 million, repurchase of  
24 convertible notes of \$29.9 million, payment of dividends of \$24.0 million,  
25 repayment of a portion of the term loan of \$18.8 million, and payment of  
26 debt issuance costs related to the issuance of convertible notes of \$9.8  
27 million.

28 46. That same day, the Company filed a Form 10-Q with the SEC which was  
signed by Defendant McLaughlin, and reiterated the Company's previously announced  
quarterly financial results and financial position. In addition, the Form 10-Q contained  
signed SOX certifications by Defendant McLaughlin, stating that the financial  
information contained in the Form 10-Q was accurate and disclosed any material changes  
to the Company's internal control over financial reporting.

47. The statements referenced in ¶¶ 41 - 46 above were materially false and/or  
misleading because they misrepresented and failed to disclose the following adverse facts  
pertaining to the Company's business, operations, prospects and performance, which



1 were known to Defendants or recklessly disregarded by them. Specifically, Defendants  
2 made false and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose that: (1) the Company  
3 was overstating its: (i) total revenues; (ii) royalty revenues; (iii) net income; and (iv) net  
4 cash provided by operating activities; (2) the Company was understating operating  
5 expenses; (3) the Company failed to properly classify royalty and milestone payments  
6 due under an agreement with Depomed; and (4) as a result of the above, the Company's  
7 financial statements were materially false and misleading at all relevant times.  
8

9 **The Truth Slowly Emerges**

10 48. In the Form 10-Q filed with the SEC on May 12, 2014, the Company  
11 disclosed that PDL was currently engaged in ongoing discussions with the SEC staff after  
12 receiving a comment letter to the Company's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the fiscal  
13 year ended December 31, 2013 that requested additional information about the  
14 Company's accounting for the royalty purchase and sale agreement with Depomed. At  
15 the time, the Company classified the asset as an intangible asset, but was being asked to  
16 support its position and explain why it is not a financial asset.  
17

18 49. On August 8, 2014, the Company issued a press release announcing that it  
19 had filed a Form 12b-25 Notification of Late Filing with the SEC allowing for a five-day  
20 extension to file its Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the period ended June 30, 2014.  
21 According to the press release, the Company could not finalize its financial statements for  
22 the quarter ended June 30, 2014, due to additional time necessary to address SEC  
23 comments and finalize its review related to a change in the accounting treatment of the  
24 acquisition of Depomed royalty rights. As a result of the delay in filing the quarterly  
25 report, PDL postponed its second quarter earnings release call, originally scheduled for  
26 Monday, August 11, 2014.  
27  
28



1           50. On August 18, 2014, the Company issued press release announcing  
2 delayed results for the second quarter and six months ended June 30, 2014. The press  
3 release stated, in part:

4           Total revenues for the second quarter of 2014 increased approximately 10  
5 percent to \$162.8 million from \$148.5 million in the second quarter of  
6 2013. Revenues for the second quarter of 2014 include royalty payments  
7 from PDL's licensees to the Queen et al. patents, net royalty payments  
8 from Depomed, the change in fair value of the Depomed asset, and interest  
9 revenue from notes receivable debt financings to late stage healthcare  
products in 2014 versus a tiered rate in 2013.

10           The second quarter 2014 royalty payment received from Genentech  
11 products was for worldwide net sales in the first quarter 2014. Prior to  
12 2014, PDL's second quarter Genentech royalty revenue was historically  
13 the highest amount of any quarter because the applicable tiered royalty  
14 rate was three percent. However, as aggregate Genentech net sales  
15 increased with each subsequent quarter, the tiered royalty rate declined,  
16 dropping to one percent in PDL's third, fourth and first quarters. As a  
17 result, the blended royalty rate for all of 2013 for Genentech products was  
18 1.9 percent. The settlement with Genentech resulted in a single fixed  
royalty rate of 2.125 percent, which results in more uniform royalty  
revenue on a quarter-to-quarter basis in the current fiscal year. Thus, this  
decrease in Queen et al. related royalties between the second quarters of  
2013 and 2014 is a function of the transition to the new fixed royalty rate,  
which new royalty rate is anticipated to result in greater royalties to PDL  
when measured on an annual basis.

19           In the second quarter of 2014, PDL recorded a change in accounting  
20 related to its acquisition of royalty rights from Depomed. As part of this  
21 change, PDL has elected to measure these assets at fair value. The change  
22 in fair value along with net cash royalties received from Depomed is  
23 currently presented as a component of "royalty rights - change in fair  
24 value" in PDL's income statements. Of the \$34.5 million recognized in  
25 royalty rights for the quarter ended June 30, 2014, \$25.8 million were net  
26 cash royalty receipts from Depomed and \$8.7 million was the change in  
27 fair value including prior period adjustments. In recognition of its  
28 transitioning business model to acquire new revenue generating assets, the  
Company reclassified \$12.6 million in interest income in the quarter ended  
June 30, 2014 related to interest from its notes receivable to interest  
revenue, which compares to \$4.9 million in interest revenue for the second  
quarter of 2013.



KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kic@kempjones.com

1 Total revenues for the first six months of 2014 increased 23 percent to  
2 \$299.6 million, compared with \$244.1 million for the first six months of  
3 2013. The increase for the six month period of 2014 over 2013 is primarily  
4 driven by the addition of the royalty payments from PDL's purchase of  
5 Depomed's diabetes-related royalties, increased royalties in the first two  
6 quarters of 2014 related to sales of Xolair®, Kadcyla®, Perjeta®, and  
7 Actemra®, along with a higher fixed royalty rate in 2014 over the blended  
8 fixed and tiered 2013 rate, a \$13.0 million increase in interest revenue  
9 related to acquisitions of new revenue generating assets, and a \$5.0  
10 million retroactive payment in first quarter of 2014 related to our  
11 settlement agreement with Genentech, offset by a higher foreign exchange  
12 loss and higher rebate paid to Novartis AG for Lucentis.

13 Operating expenses in the second quarter of 2014 were \$6.9 million,  
14 compared with \$6.8 million in the second quarter of 2013. Operating  
15 expenses in the first six months of 2014 were \$11.5 million, compared  
16 with \$14.0 million in the first six months of 2013. The decrease in  
17 operating expenses for the first six months ended June 30, 2014, compared  
18 to the first six months ended June 30, 2013, was primarily due to a  
19 decrease in litigation legal expenses, partially offset by an increase in  
20 acquisition due diligence professional services and compensation.

21 Net income in the second quarter of 2014 was \$92.1 million, or \$0.52 per  
22 diluted share, as compared with net income in the second quarter of 2013  
23 of \$93.7 million, or \$0.62 per diluted share. Net income for the first six  
24 months of 2014 was \$164.9 million, or \$0.94 per diluted share, as  
25 compared with net income in the first six months of 2013 of \$147.2  
26 million, or \$0.96 per diluted share.

27 Net cash provided by operating activities in the first six months of 2014  
28 was \$146.2 million, compared with \$162.7 million in the first six months  
of 2013. At June 30, 2014, PDL had cash, cash equivalents and  
investments of \$217.8 million, compared with \$99.5 million at December  
31, 2013. The increase was primarily attributable to net cash provided by  
the proceeds from the February 2018 Notes issuance of \$300.0 million,  
proceeds from royalty rights - at fair value of \$49.5 million, proceeds from  
warrant issuances of \$11.4 million, and operating activities of \$146.2  
million, offset in part by cash advanced on notes receivable of \$215.0  
million, call option purchases of \$31.0 million, Series 2012 Notes  
repurchases of \$29.9 million, dividend payments of \$48.1 million, term  
loan principal payments of \$37.5 million, royalty right purchases of \$15.5  
million, and debt issuance costs of \$9.8 million related to our February  
2018 Notes.

51. That same day, the Company filed a Form 10-Q with the SEC which was  
signed by Defendant McLaughlin, and reiterated the Company's previously announced



1 quarterly financial results and financial position. In addition, the Form 10-Q contained  
2 signed SOX certifications by defendants McLaughlin and Garcia, stating that the  
3 financial information contained in the Form 10-Q was accurate and disclosed any  
4 material changes to the Company's internal control over financial reporting.

5  
6 52. The statements referenced in ¶¶ 48 – 51 were misleading because they  
7 misrepresented and failed to disclose the following adverse facts pertaining to the  
8 Company's business, operations, prospects and performance, which were known to  
9 Defendants or recklessly disregarded by them. Specifically, Defendants made false  
10 and/or misleading statements and/or failed to disclose that: (1) the Company was  
11 overstating: (i) total revenues; (ii) royalty revenues; (iii) net income; and (iv) net cash  
12 provided by operating activities; (2) the Company was understating operating expenses;  
13 and (3) as a result of the above, the Company's financial statements were materially false  
14 and misleading at all relevant times.

15  
16 **The Full Truth Emerges**

17 53. On September 16, 2014, after the market closed, the Company filed a  
18 Form 8-K with the SEC announcing that on September 11, 2014, PDL was orally notified  
19 by its independent registered accounting firm, Ernst & Young, that it was resigning  
20 effective September 11, 2014. The resignation was confirmed in a letter delivered to the  
21 Company on September 15, 2014.

22  
23 54. On this news, PDL's stock plummeted \$1.17 per share to close at \$8.48  
24 per share on September 17, 2014, a one-day decline of over 12%, on heavy trading  
25 volume.

1           55. As a result of Defendants' wrongful acts and omissions, and the  
2 precipitous decline in the market value of the Company's securities, Plaintiffs and other  
3 Class members have suffered significant losses and damages.

4                           **DERIVATIVE AND DEMAND EXCUSED ALLEGATIONS**

5           56. Plaintiffs bring this action derivatively in the right, and for the benefit, of  
6 the Company to redress injuries suffered, and to be suffered, by the Company as a direct  
7 result of the breaches of fiduciary duty, abuse of control, gross mismanagement, waste of  
8 corporate assets and unjust enrichment, as well as the aiding and abetting thereof, by the  
9 Individual Defendants. The Company is named as a nominal defendant solely in a  
10 derivative capacity. This is not a collusive action to confer jurisdiction in this Court that  
11 it would not otherwise have.

12           57. Plaintiffs will adequately and fairly represent the interests of the Company  
13 and its shareholders in enforcing and prosecuting its rights.

14           58. Plaintiffs are a current owner of the Company's common stock and have  
15 been the owner of the Company's common stock during the Class Period.

16           59. At the time that this action was commenced, the Company's Board  
17 consisted of the following directors: Defendants Lindell, McLaughlin, Sandman, Selick  
18 and Gyska.

19           60. As a result of the facts set forth herein, Plaintiffs have not made any  
20 demand on the Company's Board to institute this action against the Individual  
21 Defendants. Such demand would be a futile and useless act with respect to each and  
22 every one of the Individual Defendants because they are incapable of making an  
23 independent and disinterested decision to institute and vigorously prosecute this action  
24 for the following reasons:  
25  
26  
27  
28



1           a. Individual Defendants lack both the independence and  
2 disinterestedness required to impartially consider a demand by Plaintiffs. Individual  
3 Defendants have received substantial monetary compensation and other benefits from the  
4 Company and cannot be considered independent;

5           b. Defendant Lindell receives substantial compensation and stock  
6 options from the Company for her position. Specifically, Lindell earns an annual salary  
7 of at least \$147,500. In addition, she receives \$50,000 in stock on an annual basis.  
8 Accordingly, Lindell has a vested interest in making sure the price of stock is as high as  
9 possible. Furthermore, Lindell's position on the Board gives her a certain level of  
10 prestige in the business community. Because Lindell has substantial self-interest in the  
11 company, she cannot be considered independent in evaluating Plaintiffs' demands.

12           c. Defendant McLaughlin is the President and CEO of the Company  
13 in addition to sitting on the Board of Directors. He receives substantial compensation  
14 and stock options from PDL for these positions. In Fiscal Year 2013, he earned a total of  
15 \$2,887,125 in compensation, including stock awards of \$201,000. Accordingly,  
16 McLaughlin has a vested interest in making sure the price of stock is as high as possible.  
17 Furthermore, McLaughlin's position on the Board and as President and CEO gives him a  
18 certain level of prestige in the business community. As a result of his position with the  
19 Company, McLaughlin has a substantial level of self-interest in the Company, and the  
20 outcome of any potential litigation. Furthermore, McLaughlin signed many of the  
21 misleading documents filed with SEC, subjecting himself to liability for violations of the  
22 Securities Exchange Act. Reasonable doubt exists regarding McLaughlin's ability to be  
23 disinterested and independent in evaluating Plaintiffs' demands.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 d. Defendant Sandman receives substantial compensation and stock  
2 options from the company. Specifically, Sandman earns an annual salary of at least  
3 \$155,000. In addition, he receives \$50,000 of stock on an annual basis. Accordingly,  
4 Sandman has a vested interest in making sure the price of stock is as high as possible.  
5 Furthermore, Sandman position on the Board gives him a certain level of prestige in the  
6 business community. Reasonable doubt exists regarding Sandman's ability to be  
7 disinterested and independent in evaluating Plaintiffs' demands.  
8

9 e. Defendant Selick receives substantial compensation and stock  
10 options from the Company for his position. Specifically, Selick earns an annual salary of  
11 at least \$170,000. In addition, he receives \$50,000 of stock on an annual basis.  
12 Accordingly, Selik has a vested interest in making sure the price of stock is as high as  
13 possible. Furthermore, Selik's position on the Board gives him a certain level of prestige  
14 in the business community. Because Selik has substantial self-interest in the Company, he  
15 cannot be considered independent in evaluating Plaintiffs' demands.  
16

17 f. Defendant Gryska receives substantial compensation and stock  
18 options from the Company for her position. Specifically, Gryska earns an annual salary  
19 of at least \$120,000.00. In addition, he receives \$50,000 of stock on an annual basis.  
20 Accordingly, Gryska has a vested interest in making sure the price of stock is as high as  
21 possible. Furthermore, Gryska's position on the Board gives him a certain level of  
22 prestige in the business community. Because Gryska has substantial self-interest in the  
23 Company, he cannot be considered independent in evaluating Plaintiffs' demands.  
24

25 g. PDL's non-employee directors have received, and continue to  
26 receive, substantial compensation in the form of cash and stock option awards. These  
27 Defendants are also interested in maintaining their positions on the Board so as to  
28



1 safeguard their substantial compensation and stock options. Because of this self-interest,  
2 demand upon such individuals would be futile.

3 h. As members of the Board's Audit Committee, Defendants Lindell,  
4 Selick, and Gryska were responsible for reviewing the Company's financial statements  
5 and ensuring their accuracy and compliance with the law. Defendants Lindell, Selick,  
6 and Gryska wholly failed to exercise their fiduciary duties the Company in performing  
7 the functions required by the audit committee. Accordingly, demand upon Lindell,  
8 Selick, and Gryska would be futile.

10 i. Defendants face a substantial likelihood of being held liable for  
11 breaching their fiduciary duties of loyalty and good faith as alleged herein, and are  
12 therefore incapable of disinterestedly and independently considering a demand to  
13 commence and vigorously prosecute this action;

15 j. The entire Board and senior management participated in the  
16 wrongs complained of herein. For the reasons described herein, the Company's directors  
17 are not disinterested or independent. Pursuant to their specific duties as Board members,  
18 each was charged with the management of the Company and the conduct of its business  
19 affairs. Each of the above referenced Defendants breached the fiduciary duties they owed  
20 to the Company and its shareholders in that they failed to prevent and correct the  
21 dissemination of the Company's false and misleading statements. Thus, the Board cannot  
22 exercise independent objective judgment in deciding whether to bring this action or  
23 whether to vigorously prosecute this action because its members are interested personally  
24 in the outcome since their actions have subjected the Company to millions of dollars in  
25 potential liability for violations of applicable securities laws;

1 k. Each of the key directors knew of and/or directly benefited from  
2 the wrongdoing complained of herein thereby rendering demand futile;

3 l. The Individual Defendants approved and/or permitted the wrongs  
4 alleged herein to have occurred and participated in efforts to conceal or disguise those  
5 wrongs from the Company's stockholders or recklessly and/or negligently disregarded  
6 the wrongs complained of herein, and are therefore not disinterested parties;

7 m. In order to bring this suit, all of the Company's directors would be  
8 forced to sue themselves and persons with whom they have extensive business and  
9 personal entanglements, which they will not do, thereby excusing demand;

10 n. The acts complained of constitute violations of the fiduciary duties  
11 owed by the Company's officers and directors and these acts are incapable of ratification;

12 o. Each of the Individual Defendants authorized and/or permitted the  
13 false statements disseminated directly to the public and which were made available and  
14 distributed to shareholders, authorized and/or permitted the issuance of various of the  
15 false and misleading statements, and are principal beneficiaries of the wrongdoing  
16 alleged herein, and thus could not fairly and fully prosecute such a suit even if they  
17 instituted it;

18 p. Any suit by the Company's current directors to remedy these  
19 wrongs would likely expose the Individual Defendants and the Company to further  
20 violations of the securities laws that would result in civil actions being filed against one  
21 or more of the Individual Defendants; thus, the Individual Defendants are hopelessly  
22 conflicted in making any supposedly independent determination whether to sue  
23 themselves;

24  
25  
26  
27  
28



1           q.     The Company has been, and will continue to be, exposed to  
2     significant losses due to the wrongdoing complained of herein, yet the Individual  
3     Defendants have not filed any lawsuits against themselves or others who were  
4     responsible for that wrongful conduct to attempt to recover for the Company any part of  
5     the damages that the Company suffered and will suffer thereby; and

6  
7           r.     If the current directors were to bring this derivative action against  
8     themselves, they would thereby expose their own misconduct, which underlies  
9     allegations against them contained in a class action complaint for violations of securities  
10    law, which admissions would impair their defense of the class action and greatly  
11    increase the probability of their personal liability in the class action, in an amount likely  
12    to be in excess of any insurance coverage available to the Individual Defendants. Thus,  
13    the Individual Defendants would be forced to take positions contrary to the defenses  
14    they will likely assert in the securities class action.

15  
16           61.    Moreover, despite the Individual Defendants having knowledge of the  
17    claims and causes of action raised by Plaintiffs, the current Board has failed and refused  
18    to seek to recover for the Company for any of the wrongdoing alleged by Plaintiffs  
19    herein.

20  
21           62.    Plaintiffs, moreover, have not made any demand on shareholders of the  
22    Company to institute this action since demand would be a futile and useless act for the  
23    following reasons:

24           a.     The Company is publicly held, with 1.2 billion shares outstanding  
25                   and thousands of shareholders;

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
 Seventeenth Floor  
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
 (702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
 kic@kempjones.com

- b. Making demand on such a number of shareholders would be impossible for Plaintiffs who has no way of determining the names, addresses, or phone numbers of shareholders; and
- c. Making demand on all shareholders would force Plaintiffs to incur huge expenses, assuming all shareholders could be individually identified.

63. Furthermore, the conduct alleged herein could not have been the product of good faith business judgment, and each of the Individual Defendants faces a substantial likelihood of liability for breaching their fiduciary duties because, through their intentional misconduct, they have subjected the Company to substantial damages. Furthermore, the conduct of the Individual Defendants has subjected the Company to potential liability in connection with a securities fraud class actions entitled *Lee A. Hampe v. PDL Biopharma, Inc., et. al.*, Civ. Action No. 2:14-cv-01526-RCJ-NJK, currently pending in the United States District Court for Nevada. Through their intentional misconduct, the Individual Defendants have subjected the Company to potential costs, fines, and judgments associated with the securities class action. Such actions by the Individual Defendants cannot be protected by the business judgment rule. Accordingly, making a pre-suit demand on the Individual Defendants would be futile.

**COUNT I**  
**(AGAINST THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS FOR BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY FOR DISSEMINATING FALSE AND MISLEADING INFORMATION)**

64. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each of the preceding paragraphs as though they were set forth in full herein.

65. The Individual Defendants owed a fiduciary duty to the Company to supervise the issuance of the Company's press releases and public filings to ensure that



1 they were truthful and accurate and that such filings conformed to applicable securities  
2 laws. The Individual Defendants, however, breached their fiduciary duties by allowing  
3 the Company to issue and disseminate misleading statements and filings.

4 66. As members of the Board, the Individual Defendants were directly  
5 responsible for authorizing, permitting the authorization of, or failing to monitor the  
6 practices that resulted in violations of applicable laws as alleged herein. Each of the  
7 Individual Defendants had knowledge of, actively participated in, approved, and/or  
8 acquiesced in the wrongdoing alleged herein or abdicated his or her responsibilities with  
9 respect to this wrongdoing. The alleged acts of wrongdoing have subjected the Company  
10 to unreasonable risks of losses and expenses.

11 67. Each of the Individual Defendants' acts in causing or permitting the  
12 Company to disseminate material misrepresentations and omissions to the investing have  
13 subjected the Company to liability for violations of applicable laws, and therefore were  
14 not the product of a valid exercise of business judgment, constituting a complete  
15 abdication of their duties as officers and/or directors of the Company. As a result of the  
16 Individual Defendants' breaches, the Company's reputation in the business community  
17 and financial markets has been irreparably tarnished.

18 **COUNT II**  
19 **(AGAINST THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS FOR BREACH OF FIDUCIARY**  
20 **DUTY FOR FAILING TO PROPERLY OVERSEE AND MANAGE THE**  
21 **COMPANY)**

22 68. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each of the preceding paragraphs as  
23 though they were set forth in full herein.

24 69. The Individual Defendants owed the Company fiduciary obligations. By  
25 reason of such fiduciary obligations, the Individual Defendants specifically owed the  
26  
27  
28

1 Company the highest obligation of good faith, fair dealing, loyalty, and due care,  
2 reasonable inquiry, oversight, and supervision.

3 70. The Individual Defendants violated and breached their fiduciary duties of  
4 good faith, fair dealing, loyalty, due care, reasonable inquiry, oversight, and supervision  
5 by engaging in a sustained and systematic failure to exercise their oversight  
6 responsibilities and to ensure that the Company complied with applicable laws, rules, and  
7 regulations. As a direct and proximate result of the Individual Defendants' failure to  
8 adequately perform their fiduciary obligations, the Company has sustained significant  
9 damages monetarily and injury to its corporate image and goodwill.

10  
11 71. As a result of the misconduct alleged herein, the Individual Defendants are  
12 liable to the Company. Plaintiffs, moreover, have no adequate remedy at law.

13  
14 **COUNT III**  
15 **(AGAINST THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS FOR GROSS**  
16 **MISMANGEMENT)**

17 72. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each of the preceding paragraphs as  
18 though they were set forth in full herein.

19 73. The Individual Defendants had a duty to the Company and its shareholders  
20 to prudently supervise, manage, and control the operations, business, and internal  
21 financial accounting and disclosures of the Company. The Individual Defendants,  
22 however, by their actions, and by engaging in the wrongdoing alleged herein, abandoned  
23 and abdicated their responsibilities and duties with regard to prudently managing the  
24 business of the Company in a manner consistent with the duties imposed upon them by  
25 law. By committing the misconduct alleged herein, the Individual Defendants breached  
26 their duties of due care, diligence, and candor in the management and administration of  
27 the Company's affairs and in the use and preservation of the Company's assets.  
28



1           74. During the course of the discharge of their duties, the Individual  
2 Defendants were aware of the unreasonable risks and losses associated with their  
3 misconduct. Nevertheless, the Individual Defendants caused the Company to engage in  
4 the scheme described herein which they knew had an unreasonable risk of damage to the  
5 Company, thus breaching their duties to the Company. As a result, the Individual  
6 Defendants grossly mismanaged the Company, thereby causing damage to the Company.

7  
8                                   **COUNT IV**  
9                   **(AGAINST THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS FOR CONTRIBUTION AND**  
10                   **INDEMNIFICATION)**

11           75. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each of the preceding paragraphs as  
12 though they were set forth in full herein.

13           76. The Company is alleged to be liable to various persons, entities and/or  
14 classes by virtue of the facts alleged herein that give rise to Defendants' liability to the  
15 Company.

16           77. The Company's alleged liability on account of the wrongful acts,  
17 practices, and related misconduct alleged arises, in whole or in part, from the knowing,  
18 reckless, disloyal and/or bad faith acts or omissions of the Individual Defendants, and the  
19 Company is entitled to contribution and indemnification from each Individual Defendant  
20 in connection with all such claims that have been, are, or may in the future be asserted  
21 against the Company by virtue of the Individual Defendants' misconduct.

22  
23                                   **COUNT V**  
24                   **(AGAINST THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS FOR ABUSE OF CONTROL)**

25           78. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each of the preceding paragraphs as  
26 though they were set forth in full herein.

27           79. The Individual Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, constituted an  
28 abuse of their control over the Company.

80. As a direct and proximate result of the Individual Defendants' abuse of control, the Company has suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages for which the Individual Defendants are liable. Plaintiffs, moreover, have no adequate remedy at law.

**COUNT VI**  
**(AGAINST THE INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS FOR**  
**WASTE OF CORPORATE ASSETS)**

81. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each of the preceding paragraphs as though they were set forth in full herein.

82. The Individual Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, constituted a waste of the corporate assets of the Company.

83. As a direct and proximate result of the Individual Defendants' abuse of control, the Company has suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages for which the Individual Defendants are liable. Plaintiffs, moreover, have no adequate remedy at law.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as follows:

i. Against all of the Individual Defendants and in favor of the Company for the amount of damages sustained by the Company as a result of the Individual Defendants' breaches of fiduciary duties;

ii. Awarding to Plaintiffs the costs and disbursements of the action, including reasonable attorneys' fees, accountants' and experts' fees, costs, and expenses; and

iii. Granting such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

...

...

...

...

...



**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury.

DATED: October 20, 2014.

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP

/s/ J. Randall Jones

J. Randall Jones, Esq. (#1927)  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169

Patrick W. Powers, Esq.  
Peyton J. Healey, Esq.  
Meredith Mathews  
8150 North Central Expressway #1575  
Dallas, Texas 75206

Willie C. Briscoe, Esq.  
The Briscoe Law Firm  
8117 Preston Road #300  
Dallas, Texas 75225  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*  
*Rene A. Freely and Brian Freely*  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

KEMP, JONES & COULTHARD, LLP  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway  
Seventeenth Floor  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(702) 385-6000 • Fax (702) 385-6001  
kic@kempjones.com